

5. General

54

~~SECRET~~

7th January, 1960.

COCOM Document No. 3712.NI 1/3

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

NEW ELECTRICAL AND POWER-GENERATING ITEM NO. 1

16th December 1959 and 5th January 1960.

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents Nos. 3700.5, 3712.00/1, 3712.NI 1/1 and 2, New Item No. 1/W.P.1 and 2.

1. At the opening of the third round of discussion, the CHAIRMAN enquired whether the United States Delegation had now received their authorities' reply on the question of a possible cut-off which would enable other Delegations to consent to an embargo on electron beam welders.
2. The UNITED STATES Delegate stated his authorities' view that the range of equipment in this area was so restricted that a cut-off did not appear feasible. In their view, while this technique was recent, it was on the verge of a considerable expansion which would lead to the development of larger sizes. The Delegate repeated that the definition they had proposed referred solely to equipment which would be identified as welding equipment.
3. The FRENCH Delegate explained that the technique concerned was of recent origin and had first been employed in France two or three years previously, following the discovery that the electron microscope could be used for point welding at high temperatures. As yet, it was true, very few machines were in use, and only one patent had been sold to one factory in the United States. However, other firms, in Germany and the United States, had developed their own machines independently of the first inventors of the technique. Among existing civilian uses, the expert cited the welding of tungsten filaments. There were already numerous other civilian applications, however, and the use of this technique would spread rapidly into all fields of industry. If, moreover, the technique was new, the characteristics were neither new nor of a strategic nature. In the Bloc countries, any manufacturer of an electron microscope would soon be able to evolve the technique in the same way as the Western manufacturers had done: it was a simple matter of adaptation. The only effect of an embargo would be to draw the Bloc's attention to the value of this machine and induce them to set their engineers to work on the problem sooner than might otherwise be the case. The French Delegation therefore did not feel that an embargo was justified.
4. The GERMAN Delegate stated that his authorities could not concur with the proposal to put an embargo on this item as they believed the use of this equipment in Europe to be almost exclusively civilian. They would however, be prepared at any future date to study new supplementary arguments put forward by any Delegation.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

- 2 -

COCOA Document 712.NI 1/3

5. The UNITED STATES Delegate responded to certain points made by the German and French Delegations. He stated that this equipment was relatively new and did not exist in large numbers or in a wide variety of types or sizes. Although some civil applications for the welded materials using this process existed, cost and other factors led to the use of other well-established welding methods for civil applications. More important was the fact that electron beam welding equipment was used predominantly for welding the more advanced high alloy steels, certain non-ferrous metals and alloys most of which were now embargoed because of the predominance of military and strategic use. Thus, in countries with large military programmes the use of such equipment would be predominantly strategic; this was now clearly so in the United States and the Bloc. He said that Free World technical developments in this field were more advanced than those in the Bloc. He noted that many of the uses of such equipment were public knowledge, and the Bloc was well aware of its significance; therefore, addition of the item to national control lists should not be viewed as inducing further Bloc developmental effort. He assumed that other Governments would wish to review the records of discussion on this item, and trusted that they would then be able to agree to the embargo of electron beam welders.

6. The ITALIAN Delegate, confirming their previous willingness to join the majority, expressed his conviction that the Committee would always, as in the past, be prepared to listen to the United States Delegation should they decide to raise the question again in the future.

7. The BELGIAN, JAPANESE and NETHERLANDS Delegates associated themselves with the Italian Delegate's statement.

8. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate said that, on the basis of the information adduced to the Committee, he felt that the case must be regarded as not proven. If, however, the United States Delegation should wish to have the matter debated in January, he was sure that all Delegations would give it sympathetic consideration in the light of any additional information which might be produced.

9. On the 5th January, 1960, the UNITED STATES Delegate drew the Committee's attention to the information given in the document submitted on the 23rd November, 1959 under the heading "Electrical and Power Generating Equipment New Item No. 1/W.P.2" (reproduced as an Appendix hereto). The Delegate believed that, taken in conjunction with the present and previous records of discussion, this should provide an adequate basis to enable the authorities of Member Governments to give further and favourable consideration to the United States Delegation's embargo proposal.

CONCLUSION : The COMMITTEE was unable to agree to place this item under embargo at present. It was agreed, however, that discussion would be resumed on the 1st February, 1960.

~~SECRET~~